has reported that the bankruptcy proceedings against Enron Corporation under US law have no impact on DPC or DPC's assets and as such the same do not affect the security interest of DPC lenders.

Outstanding loans against State Governments

99. SHRI BRAHMAKUMAR BHATT: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) the State-wise Central loans including interest outstanding against the State Governments during last three years;

(b) the details of loans and advances made to the State Governments;

(c) how much loans have been writtenoff, State-wise; and

(d) the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL): (a) and (b) Outstanding loans against each State as on 31st March, 1999, 31st March, 2000 and 31st March, 2001 in respect of Ministry of Finance and loans & advances released to the States during 2000-2001 are indicated in the statement (*See* below). Information in respect of loans forming part of plan schemes of different Ministries is not centrally maintained.

(c) and (d) During the financial year 2000-2001, an amount of Rs. 58.54 crores has been writtenoff in respect of Andhra Pradesh (Rs. 28.82 crores), Assam (Rs. 7.60 crores), Bihar (Rs. 5.48 crores), Karnataka (Rs. 1.56 crores), Madhya Pradesh (Rs. 9.07 crores) and Rajasthan (Rs. 6.01 crores). These amounts were writtenoff according to the General Debt Relief Scheme recommended by the Tenth Finance Commission, linked to fiscal improvement.

Statement

Details of Outstanding Loans against each State Government

(Rs. in crore)

Sl. No.	State	Loans Outstanding as on 31.3.1999	Loans Outstanding as on 31.3.2000	Loans Out-standing as on 31.3.2001	Block loans released during 2000-01	Ways & Means advance released during 2000-01
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	13783.14	15253.52	16162.39	1772.71	75.00
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	308.96	347.11	392.29	61.09	
3.	Assam	3896.28	4083.44	3712.64	168.85	200.00
4.	Bihar	13152.59	14177.67	11123.46	1031.50	
5.	Chhattisgarh	0.00	0.00	2835.16	296.73	
6.	Goa	954.78	966.85	793.35	104.88	
7.	Gujarat	14309.10	14863.29	15790.42	1465.79	550.00
8.	Haryana	4853.02	5039.47	5238.71	387.21	
9.	Himachal Pradesh	2628.20	2770.95	2697.56	104.93	110.00
10.	Jharkhand	0.00	0.00	3783.34	356.27	
11.	J&K	3330.86	3732.69	3398.21	170.03	
12.	Karnataka	8813.64	9380.76	10011.54	1029.40	
13.	Kerala	5581.99	5835.52	6017.80	463.92	185.00
14.	Madhya Pradesh	9018.61	9969.57	7759.08	785.57	
15.	Maharashtra	23081.67	23120.69	23040.53	771.90	
16.	Manipur	307.83	452.14	383.59	38.02	296.00
17.	Meghalaya	293.21	315.46	340.93	41.47	
18.	Mizoram	200.73	328.80	254.16	38.04	
19.	Nagaland	298.31	405.04	356.59	44.38	
20.	Orissa	6519.14	7352.66	7707.84	938.52	250.00
21.	Punjab	12326.84	12368.93	12463.84	367.26	250.00
22.	Rajasthan	9707.47	10542.04	10436.25	706.94	50.00
23.	Sikkim	181.28	228.44	211.92	24.66	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	Tamil Nadu	10598.81	11118.91	11746.47	1140.04	—
25.	Tripura	515.33	584.66	634.37	74.68	—
26.	Uttaranchal	0.00	0.00	1661.91	214.83	—
27.	Uttar Pradesh	28702.29	30526.27	30412.98	3120.45	256.00
28.	West Bengal	21304.64	22195.38	22809.40	1303.71	200.00
	TOTAL:	194668.72	205960.26	212176.73	17023.78	2422.00

NOTE: Amount of Interest outstanding against each State as on 31st March, 1999, 31st March, 2000 and 31st March, 2001 may please be treated as Nil.

SEBI's investigation into security scam

100. SHRI AIMADUDDIN AHMED KHAN (DURRU): Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether SEBI investigations into the recent securities scam, with Ketan Parikh's 'K-10' as the main players revealed serious rigging of the market in selected scrips; and

(b) if so, the details of the findings; and the action taken to recover the ill-gotten money and to meet out justice to the common investors?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL): (a) and (b) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Emergency financial powers to Government

101. SHRI AIMADUDDIN AHMED KHAN (DURRU): Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government has decided to assume emergency financial powers to increase excise and customs duties irrespective of any legal limitations;

(b) if so, the decision taken in the matter; and

(c) the details of the increases in duties affected under these emergency powers?